

REMARKS

Claims 2-7 and 12-16 are pending in the above application. By the above amendment, claim 16 has been added.

The Office Action dated January 11, 2006, has been received and carefully reviewed. In that Office Action, claims 2-7 and 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim. Claim 2 has been amended to further distinguish over the references of record. Because it is not believed that Kim shows every element required by the pending claims, reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-7 and 12-16 is respectfully requested.

The following discussion addresses the drawings of Kim, in particular Figure 4 and 5. As an initial matter, it is noted that Figure 4 of Kim includes two TCP's designated 210 and 210'. The elements on TCP 210' are all designated with primes with the exception of lines 214; none of the elements on TCP 210 include primes with the exception of IC 212. For consistency, in this response, reference numerals without primes will be used to identify elements on TCP 210 and reference numerals with primes will be used to identify elements on TCP 210'.

Kim has been carefully considered in view of the detailed rejection provided in the latest Office Action. Based on this review, it is believed that Kim's specification may show that some signals from signal transmission pattern 223 reach IC 212 via input pattern 213, some signals from signal transmission pattern 223 travel through a signal output pattern 214 to signal input pattern 213' on TCP 210' and some signals from signal transmission pattern 223 travel through a signal output pattern 214 to reach a signal output pattern 214' on TCP 210'. However, it is respectfully submitted that this understanding cannot be obtained from Figure 4 by itself. The symmetrical nature of the lines on TCP's 210 and 210' and the substrate, for example, suggest that signals on lines 214 will be transferred to lines 214' on TCP 210' and will never reach an IC. No lines are shown which would take some signals from output lines 214 and transfer them to input lines 213' and other signals from output lines 214 and transfer them to output lines 214'. It is therefore submitted that like Figure 5, Figure 4 is schematic. One of ordinary skill in the art will understand what is intended from Kim's detailed description in combination with Figures 4 and 5 but will not understand Figures 4 and 5 to show the actual wiring that is used to carry out the described invention.

Claim 2 requires that a claimed plurality of wiring groups have identical board side wiring patterns. Kim's specification is silent as to whether TCP's 210, 210' have identical patterns. Figure 5 suggests that they are different, but as the examiner notes in the response to arguments section of the Office Action, Figure 5 is intended to show the operation of the device and not to show its exact structure. Figure 4 suggests that the wiring patterns may be the same. Applicant submits however that Figure 4 is also schematic and therefore, like Figure 5, cannot be relied upon to show that the wiring patterns on TCP's 210, 210' are identical. Because the schematic diagram of Figure 4 cannot be relied upon to show that TCP's 210 and 210' are identical, Kim does not show every limitation required by claim 2, and it is submitted that claim 2 is not anticipated by Kim and is allowable over the art of record.

Claims 3-7, 12 and 13 depend from claim 2 and are submitted to be allowable for the same reasons as claim 2.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim. Claim 14 requires "a second wiring board identical to the first wiring board." As argued above in connection with claim 2, Kim does not disclose identical wiring boards as claimed. Claim 14 and its dependent claims 15 and 16 are therefore submitted to be allowable over Kim for the same reasons as claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Each issue raised in the Office Action dated January 11, 2006, has been addressed, and it is submitted that claims 2-7 and 12-16 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, the reconsideration and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Scott Wakeman (Reg. No. 37,750) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No. 10/662,453
Amendment dated April 6, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 11, 2006

Docket No.: 4633-0107P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time

Dated: April 6, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Charles Gorenstein

Registration No.: 29,271

Scott T. Wakeman

Registration No.: 37,750

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorneys for Applicant